	If you have any additional comments about the culture of scientific integrity related to the foll... - Q79#1 - factors that hindered or supported your scientific integrity efforts at EPA - Please insert comments in the text boxes below
1	When managers or key employees trivialize the Agency's quality process as an administrative process thereby cutting the key link to our processes for achieving integrity.
2	N/A
3	Slow reviews of products and papers at all levels.
4	The previous administration did not appear to have appreciated science or integrity.
5	There is an element of trying to please/meet a common goal/customer service that could be an unconscious or soft form of influence. (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A) [redacted]
6	Noise. Too much noise in terms of science communication. What sometimes appears to be a scientific integrity issue at first impression, I find, sometimes, with attention, has turned into a rich conversation about an environmental issue and the actual state of knowledge. An example for me was a scientist saying a pipeline was technically feasible, and, a political appointee saying a pipeline was not technically feasible. Basically, a technical expert opinion vs. a generalist political appointee opinion. At the end of the day, because of hierarchy, EPA went with a kind of middle ground. Was this an integrity issue? I don't know. I think that the 'pipeline feasibility' question ultimately needed more science, more evidence. Altogether, complicated.
7	I didn't trust officials brought in by the Trump administration.
8	(b) (5), (b) (6) [redacted]
9	N/A; This does not appear to be directly applicable to my work duties
10	previous administration did not support integrity of scientific integrity in policy or regulatory decisions
11	Please revise: ORD Policy and Procedure Manual SECTION 13.4 - QA/QC PRACTICES FOR ORD...RESEARCH. Balance calibrations that "bound the range of use" are unnecessary for electronic balances. (See USP <41> regulations, and Mettler's Good Weighing Practices.)
12	management team presses to meet timelines when sacrificing quality. Management team is more concerned about deadlines than sound scientific products
13	Lack of scientific knowledge at the EPA management /decisionmaker level leaves them unable to advocate for sound science based decisions under dispute once matters are elevated. Most of the science expertise is at the staff level, management are not required to have a science background or to be trained in science, thus, decisions are largely political. In our region, there is a belief that " a manager is a manager is a manager" and any manager can do any job, whether or not they have experience or expertise in the area they are supervising and making decisions over. Management tends to rally around and protect bad managers; (b) (7)(A) [redacted]
14	Political leadership made decisions about technical comments and whether we would submit or revise--not aligned with staff recommendations.
15	With respect to the work of our office, political leadership dismantled venues for scientific inquiry and conclusion. Career leadership encouraged continued research and investment (albeit with resources limited by political decision makers), but political leadership disrupted normal mechanisms for producing and distributing scientific products
16	Messages from senior management and repeated down the management chain were clear that political positions would be the information coming out of the agency and not necessarily science. This is exacerbated by efforts to shield the bases for public health and scientific decisions by withholding documents under FOIA; this threatens the Agency's scientific integrity because if the public wasn't going to see what the agency scientists are saying, then the political leadership could make decisions without regard for the science. This approach was reflected in the COVID safety arena, management ignored science and sound public health criteria in its approach to what was considered in reopening decision-making.
17	Inspection findings at federal facilities (namely Department of Defense facilities) during the previous administration had to go through a more diplomatic process to alleviate problems. Non-federal facilities don't have the same bureaucracy and red tape to mitigate issues because they do not have the same high profile nature.
18	Challenges by non-scientific managers who did not believe or accept the data presented by scientists and engineers.
19	Time and staff (i.e., (b) (6), (b) (7)(A) [redacted]). Coupled with (b) (6) [redacted] t is a recipe for uncertainty in decisions that are easily challenged and viewed as scientific integrity claims.
20	No comment
21	The "Transparency Rule" was no more than institutional gaslighting. Even from our small corner of the agency it was obvious suppression of data otherwise available to support decisions.
22	The questions do not fit the reality. If given the green light to work in a certain area the work proceeded without much interference. The real influence came at the level where the work area was just shut down. In other words there really was no influence on the work that was assigned. What was influenced was certain topics of work was not assigned nor funded, so no work happened and therefore no concerns about scientific integrity occurred.
23	Control of communication of EPA work by (b) (6) [redacted]
24	Most work related to climate change was not allowed to be communicated.
25	When the scientific results indicate action is needed, the complaints from our partners/states that such actions would cause more work often drives the decision-making process, resulting in complaints having more influence than the science.
26	A manager in our region who was hired by political appointees in recent years for a career position will continue to suppress scientific opinions from staff and other subject matter experts.
27	(b) (6) [redacted] to be innovative in seeking knowledge
28	(b) (7)(A) [redacted]
29	Political pressure that went down the management chain.
30	Fearing that HQ is out of touch with the regions.
31	HQ political leadership knew where they wanted to go and if the science or recommendations didn't align with that vision, it was ignored
32	No basis to judge.
33	N/A
34	Lack of trust in the management at local, but mostly higher levels in EPA
35	Lack of training and transparency for newer employees on the expectations of scientific integrity policy.
36	Policy decisions were made before the science was completed. Data was eliminated from consideration if it would not support the selected policy decision.

37 Decisions at the Division Director level detrimental to the environment based on "what the state wants" rather than science.
38
Upper management's fear of backlash from Political leaders for good science that disagrees with the political agenda, this fear cascades down through the management chain.
39
(b) (6), (b) (7)(A)
40 The Region does not have a clear, effective clearance procedure for scientific products. In many cases, Regions lack appropriate scientific expertise at supervisory level to be able to do the needed review and approval.
41 Reports that need to go through multiple levels of review can be altered to remove language management thinks reflects poorly on programs
42 (b) (6)
43 Not applicable
44 Use of PARS-compliant performance documentation tools to retaliate against employees who use evidence to inform objective performance reviews.
45
Seniors managers at the Region had complete disregard for staff review of the scientific basis of (b) (6). They actively worked with states to undermine staff recommendations on (b) (6), This includes Trump appointees who later took permanent EPA positions and are still at the Agency, like former (b) (6). Managers bent over backwards to try to figure out ways to approve (b) (6) that did not have scientific justification.
46 Agency has been somewhat short-handed with staff spread thin across multiple projects due to budget; this seems to be improving
47
Lost research and documents about climate change and my program was pushed to work on lower priority items (b) (6)
48 N/A
49 There was a clear understanding that only a lessening of the regulations was going to be looked at by the Trump administration.
50 It was clear that my analytical talents were not relevant to decision makers. I went on detail to another agency where, ironically, they were valued.
51
numerous factors including management interference, general threats to program, workload, tasking of staff to other projects, and frequent re-prioritization have hindered the timely completion, release of scientific findings, open concerns with other EPA offices scientific approaches, and/or a general chilling effect.
52 Delays in review of scientific products
53 This survey is over the past 2 years. Science integrity has improved in the past year.
54 N/A
55 lack of transparency or set timelines once a highly visible product went in for managerial review
56 (b) (6) .
57
Mismanagement of employees has driven scientists to operate at a frantic pace. When every project, even every sample present a potentially new challenge, it is up to the scientists in the lab to define how to test and report results. Under current management, all the way to DC, they don't care about anything other than turning projects around expeditiously not knowing or caring about the difficulties encountered by the scientists or the science generated. We now have re-work being done (on a couple projects) by seasoned scientists because newer scientists failed to fully get training on aspects of the science necessary (b) (7)(A), (b) (6)
58 Administration at highest level was openly antagonistic to both science and integrity
59
Internal censure. Sort of a 'live to fight another day' mentality. Additional higher-level approvals added that would delay and discourage release or submission of products.
60 It has been helpful to have immediate managers with strong science based background which was also willing and available to openly discuss scientific products and any science related issues/questions associated with such product(s).
61 N/A
62 Management not addressing scientific integrity issues
63 There are important issues that we have not been able to explore because they are thought to be politically sensitive
64
(b) (6), (b) (7)(A)
65 This questionnaire asks about the last two years (2019-2020). I have not witnessed problems with scientific integrity during this time period. My answers would have been very different at the political level if you had asked about 2017-2018.
66 a certain (b) (6) in the (b) (6) does not support scientific integrity efforts. She believes that everything is under her authority. she does not understand the agency's scientific integrity policy. She needs training.
67 ORD was viewed negatively by some in the Agency
68
My (b) (6) blocked any attempts to meet with and work through any conflicts with the (b) (6). He said it was to (b) (5). I don't know who was blocking what and at what level. I know my (b) (6) continued to advocate for my ability to express scientific opinions.
69 See above for support; collaborative efforts between different parts of the agency have sometimes led to long delays in getting science out to the public, but I'm not sure if it's a scientific integrity issue or something else. Some collaborative efforts have led to edits by high level individuals that may not reflect as accurately the specific concerns expressed. Not exactly suppression, but modification to minimize.
70 (b) (5)
71 I have learned that raising issues about bad research is dismissed, and not addressed. I've given up raising such issues.
72 none
73 Scientific integrity and transparency was hindered by the administration at the time.
74 The Trump administration's political appointees stifled scientific integrity at EPA. The administration's hires for career positions, specifically t(b) (6), continue to hinder scientific integrity at EPA.
75 The previous administration's lack of transparency.
76 I am new hire, without the work history at EPA to meaningfully comment.
77 (b) (7)(A), (b) (6), (b) (5)

78 Dishonest managers looking to target employees.
79 perceptions that all EPA employees that were attending public meetings were supposed to get sr. mgmt. clearance ahead of time.
80 (b) (7)(A), (b) (5), (b) (6) [redacted]
81 my data was removed from a report because the administration didn't want to show the (b) (6) [redacted]
82 Egos and politics.
83 More guidance is needed for folks completing scientific studies at EPA.
84 You need a "Not Applicable" answer - I do not have any scientific opinions, as I am an Architect!
85 Clear guidance on when pending results should be released when risk assessment/ reporting has not been completed.
86 No basis to respond- hired 8/2020
87 Political appointee involvement in decision-making has thwarted timely release of reports.
88 (b) (6) [redacted]
89 Difficulty understanding what is a policy decision versus a decision that is simply sub-verting evidence provided by science. For instance, in a risk evaluation if risk is indicated based on scientific evidence, why is it considered reasonable?
90 Political appointees made decisions that ignored science and were based on politics. Science was sidelined and ignored for many decisions. Scientists were removed/replaced if they spoke out for science and scientific integrity.
91 I have found that political appointees (both under democratic and republican administrations) exert too much undue influence on the science and decision-making when they are not close enough to the work. under the last administration, there were too many deputy assistant administrators trying to wield influence and some of them were not qualified to make those decisions.
92 (b) (6) [redacted]
93 (b) (6) [redacted] program supervisors hinder EPA scientific integrity efforts.
94 Joined the agency late 2020 so cannot answer previous questions
95 My position does not involve science
96 having first line supervisors to act as advocates for your behalf really helps deal with scientific integrity issues
97 n/a
98 (b) (6), (b) (5) [redacted]
99 Editing and delayed clearance of manuscript due to discussions about "messaging" by program office and region.
100 It was clear that high-level appointees at headquarters could not be relied upon to act with integrity and would not take seriously the advice/findings of career scientists if it did not suit their own or the administration's political purposes.
101 (b) (6) [redacted]
102 I am new to the agency this time around but when I worked at EPA from 2004 to 2013, I felt comfortable using science and felt supported in sharing and learning more science to make EPA's work robust and unbiased.
103 Fear of being misunderstood or be made to look foolish because the scientific themes are complicated.
104 admin
105 In general I don't feel like dissenting opinions are treated well at EPA, especially scientific ones. This is a pervasive issue in program activities regardless of administration. The added layer in the past four years has been the culture of fear around dissenting scientific opinions on particular topics and it being across EPA and not just a problem with EPA programs.
106 Political interference and reviews that lead to delays in products and edits that were not accurate or supported by the science.
107 (b) (6) [redacted]
108 not being able to use "climate change" in my presentations and publications.
109 Stated policies aren't worth the dead wood and electrons used to publish them. Political appointees and lawyers are totally in control of the fiasco that is this agency.
110 The EO that prohibited use of terminology like environmental racism, white fragility, etc.
111 Having to go through additional clearance procedures and notify/wait for comments from other EPA Offices on hot topics. This procedure significantly slows down the process of getting scientific information out to journals.
112 I appreciate the clarify and transparency of (b) (6) [redacted], however, laying on all of the additional layers of systems, create an additional burden for the scientists. Some of this system integration is helpful, some if it is not, but I don't know if it is truly being seen through a lens of scientific integrity.
113 Too much management - corporatization of hiring decisions, research project decisions, and budget decisions. While this has been worsening with time, but it started well before 2019. (b) (6) [redacted] While the problem is reaching it's crux at the moment, this did not begin in 2019/2020. The expansion of term limited positions and contract over internal expertise has also impacted the willingness of employees to voice opinions and has eroded trust overtime.
114 My work has been censored, objections I raised about policy decisions based on my analysis of scientific data were discounted, or not fully conveyed to decision-makers by middle management. I have become so discouraged at the lack of integrity in my current organization that I am currently looking for a transfer opportunity.
115 Fear of reprisal for any science which did not comport with political leadership's agenda hindered scientific (and other) integrity.
116 Political appointees doubting scientific conclusions and in some cases adding in language with the purpose of discrediting large assessments.
117 New Employee
118 N/A
119 (b) (6) [redacted]
120 Pressure on program offices and regions by special interests to stop completion of documents that were in final stages of completion
121 We were hindered consistently by worries that we "would get in trouble" if we did this or that. I had never previously heard that term outside of grade school and certainly not in a work environment.
122 seeing others around me with high scientific integrity helps a lot
123 Job descriptions have become very narrow; scientific activities for basic and applied research are largely 'extracurricular' for many positions. Change this!
124 Division Directors who are very nervous about scientific studies or their implications, and not wanting to disagree with or place states in a difficult position.
125 AA-level management timelines and review of documents.
126 (b) (6) [redacted] managers are supportive of science project and efforts, promoting good science. It would be useful to provide travel resources for research projects to oversee contractors and ensure data collection quality.
127 There is a "trust" crisis in which a large segment of the population does not trust the integrity of scientific pursuits or assumes ulterior motives - simply relying on a "shield" of scientific integrity to justify policy actions may satisfy only the scientists in the short run. Building trust will require non-conventional innovative public engagement that better explains the scientific process.

128 None
129 N/A
130 nothing
131 Hindered by management egos; supported in cases where the sheer weight of scientific evidence and data is impossible to ignore
132 For my position nothing has changed over the full 5 years working at EPA and 8 years working in government in terms of scientific integrity. I follow the principles of scientific integrity and have never had an issue with work products or ideas being suppressed throughout my career.
133 NA
134 Upper Management Interference
135 industry and lack of regulation
136 my job doesn't have anything to do with scientific opinions, etc.
137 Policy decisions were not based on scientific data at the highest agency levels.
138 IT policies sometimes interfere with science and data collection by dictating how IT equipment can be used. Some types data of collection are not compatible with IT policies and/or software.
139 na
140 Working with Other Regions on similar Sites
141 (b) (6) has cut staff from the regulatory work that my section is in engaged in. This core agency work requires regulatory decision making based on sound science. Poor screening of candidates makes hiring the best scientists & engineers very difficult.
142 n/a
143 Under the previous administration, documents were slow-walked and opinions of scientist or staff were not generally considered.
144 Trump Administration denied science.
145 (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A) [redacted]
146 Hierarchy enabling management to conveniently ignore data that leads to conclusions that could slow down their workflow, especially as it concerns environmental justice issues.
147 Scientist being able to ignore EPA rules and guidelines because they are favored by senior management who were once scientists themselves. There seems to be no impartial management, too much favoritism, and staff/post-docs/SEES/Student Service Contractor relationships that seem questionable in terms of work assignments and what is allowed.
148 It's hard to express scientific opinions to an Administration that didn't seem to believe in science.
149 same as previous comment. (b) (6) [redacted] that science dictated not to. Horrible.
150 The biggest factor that hinders scientific integrity is unrealistically tight schedules that preclude normal processes (e.g., ADP process) from being carried out.
151 Management often suppressed information brought to their attention by employees which highlighted fraud and raised serious questions regarding scientific integrity issues.
152 All had to do with the administration at that time
153 Decision makers did not hinder the process of generating scientifically based comments, but after the comments were generated...they ignored them.
154 inadequate/unprotected processes for addressing scientific integrity issues at higher levels of EPA
155 (b) (5) [redacted]
156 Supervisors & Managers making decisions had no background in the area of science needed, ex - Engineers are NOT Biologists!
157 (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A) [redacted]
158 political appointees
159 None
160 Having management take the time to understand the technical issues meant they were able to balance political needs and science with integrity.
161 political appointees and their politically appointed managers did not allow open expression of scientific opinions and undermined scientific integrity
162 The approval chain has drifted from policy review to something controlling and burdensome. Particularly when we have a cover all disclaimer.
163 (b) (5) [redacted]
164 The racist Trump and Wheeler administrations actively shut down desenting science based policies. I personally changed jobs so that I would not be part of misinformation, bad policy decisions and potential lawsuits following bad decisions. I also did not want to be part of future FOIA requests which would have shown my role in these decisions.
165 EPA leadership was hostile and uncooperative with the OIG. This hindered our ability to do our job and uphold the scientific integrity of the EPA.
166 Self-preservation efforts appear to have weaseled their way to hinder influence aspects of the research processes and evidence-based policy interests.
167 Not truer, disagree.
168 Blind allegiance to the popular anthropogenic climate change narrative.
169 (b) (6) [redacted] Scientific integrity was a joke.
170 Unable to fallow data with additional research because it may disagree with the views of the administration
171 (b) (5) [redacted]
172 Our QA program greatly hinders scientific integrity. (b) (5) [redacted] You could have poor data, but if your paperwork is good you are set. It's a wrong approach that is unique to (b) (6) and greatly hinders our ability to protect the environment.
173 NA
174 Money, assuredly. Telling affected citizens that their poor health is not from across the street but their living style. Granted, in some instances they may be correct. EPA should be willing to do the research to find the truth.
175 Hindered: Invoking policies requiring excessive documentation review and approval from senior level political appointees that typically were non-scientists. Politics must not drive the science. The science must independently inform the politicians.
176 Support for scientific integrity starts at the top and requires a culture that honors and respects scientific research and findings regardless of how they may impact public policy.
177 the new rapid system is a mess Not necessarily an integrity issue but it hinders efficiency
178 (b) (6) [redacted]

179 (b) (6) .
180 We are working with legacy reports that, while updated, do not provide the right data needed to make current and future decisions.
181 No Comment
182 (b) (6), (b) (7)(A)
183 Politics and an administration that didn't want to share science.
184 (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A)
185 n/a
186 Much of my work involves PFAS - a complex family of contaminants.
187 I think the interference comes more in decisions about what to study and what stakeholders to involve than on release of findings. This is especially important for environmental justice and ensuring we are able to even begin research that is meaningful in this area.
188 na
189 Neither -- I had no purely scientific projects
190 Any finding that place our state environmental partners in a negative light is many times altered or suppressed.
191 During the previous administration, it was clear that we were not free to work with full scientific integrity since almost all reasonable scientific truths were contrary to official administration policies
192 (b) (6)
193 Undue political influence was detrimental to the EPA.
194 Oppressive upper management.
195 It was strange to have an Administrator for EPA with past experience that was out of line with EPA's mission. I did not have faith that he had the best interests for EPA.
196 Made assumptions everyone followed integrity/ethical behavior.
197 Sometimes it appears the level of staffing or the level of work that staff have to review reports/assessments can make the review process time consuming, which may be frustrating for members of the public.
198 Political influence from political appointees have hindered scientific integrity efforts at EPA. Career staff have supported scientific integrity when not intimidated by EPA politicals/management to do otherwise.
199 a culture of fear and denial of basic scientific tenants
200 (b) (6) poor performance and protection of managers
201 The Division Director's concern for their PARS rating hindered scientific integrity because they drove performance measures they could cite as improvements at the expense of data quality.
202 see above
203 N/A
204 Sometimes the lack of raw data makes it hard to make a decision, or delays from requesting studies or additional data effects timelines.
205 No obstacles have been encountered
206 NA
207 I entered somewhat agree to the last couple of questions, because I don't specifically work on scientific products
208 I overall have felt and feel listened to and supported by my first and second line supervisors when I have suggestions or ideas on how to improve our data collection and analysis to support decision-making. The support may extend above those management levels, but my interaction with those managers is very minimal.
209 (b) (7)(A), (b) (6), (b) (5) It was a disgrace.
210 n/a
211 no comments
212 The highest levels of Trump's EPA were not devoted to scientific integrity.
213 Review by political appointees. (b) (6) in general were extremely disruptive and led to a complete failure of timely delivery of scientific products.
214 N/A
215 political appointees hindered scientific integrity efforts at EPA
216 (b) (7)(A), (b) (5)
217 technical experts were deliberately excluded from meetings. employees asked senior managers (b) (6) to include them and were told no.
218 I would say that the political climate, interference by EPA high level political appointees in decision making or their lack of action hindered my and some other colleagues abilities to have outcomes reflect scientific integrity.
219 interpersonal conflict/miscommunication
220 No additional comments
221 Management, at the division, office and AA levels, does not support publishing our findings at meetings and in the scientific literature. This is not a resource issue; it is a fundamental lack of support for career scientists to release their tax-payer funded research to the public.
222 (b) (7)(A), (b) (5)
223 overbearing, controlling immediate supervisor whose motives are to solely satisfy immediate upper management
224 Items I produced that didn't have prior AA office review were now required to go to the AA's office and the Office of Public Affairs for review prior to release.
225 Senior management directing what science opinions and products move forward
226 (b) (6) doesn't get the resources it needs to do the technical job it needs to do. This has been a fact year in and year out since I've been a manager for about 10 years. We are always scraping things together to try to make the best of things when we know even a little more resources on infrastructure and foundational data (like inventory data and monitoring data) would make a world of difference.
227 (b) (5)
228 Previous administration political appointees direct interference with research, investigations, and enforcement related to public health and environmental findings or concerns.
229 Too much political appointee influence in scientific decisions causing major employee stress

230 n/a
231 No opportunity for communications staff to understand dissenting viewpoints that stakeholders may have. At the staff level many were concerned about openly discussing this, which was especially hard when working remotely and unable to have "offline" conversations.
232 Lack of support from senior managers
233 none
234
Not for me specifically, but I know that work of my colleagues in other division were strongly hindered due to political pressures from previous administration.
235 ELMS and a slew of other redundant tracking systems implemented along with regulatory decisions and rules which were arbitrary and capricious and which distracted from assigned work
236 senior management unwilling to raise concerns due to political structure
237 political management. Basically you were blackballed if you presented anything different than what they wanted to hear.
238
(b) (5) This didn't stop or start with the previous Administration
239 1) Lack of budget - 4 years of $0 budget despite the MANDATORY requirements under (b) (6) 2) No management support by the (b) (6) without any consideration of the work and the work load - more time was spent on considering (b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(A) Scientific bias expressed by political appointees -- the worst I've seen in 30 years working at EPA
240 People having emotional reactions to data they didn't like.
241 Managers who align themselves with politically-appointed Regional Administrators. They "hinder" employees.
242 Delay in approving materials
243 same as above
244
One project resulted in a rulemaking supposedly going to be in two parts. The first part went through and the second part was dropped. This was not my expectation in discussions with mgr and other team staff up to and through the first rule. Some issues hence did not get addressed for they were put aside for the second rule.
245 Politics whether from the right or left. Science should not be dictated by either side.
246 Many senior politicals and managers have few scientific credentials.
247 Conflict between Contract constraints and science quality
248 EPA administration for the last 2 years
249
QA teams are phenomenal, and while no one likes jumping through hoops, the QAPPs and other procedures ensure we have a great product throughout the system.
250 The fact that politicals could and did go in and alter/censor scientific outputs was demoralizing for all of us, not just those whos products were directly censored. It also made our managment (even more) risk averse
251 The highest levels of decision makers were more concerned about their own policies than scientific integrity, which affected decision makers at all levels.
252 The previous administration did not share or consult regions on issues with national implications.
253 Not very sure
254 Politics
255 Political interference with scientific reports and products undermined the objectives of the Scientific Integrity Policy.
256 political influence by the Trump administration prevented or delayed good scientific decisions from being made
257 Where I indicated somewhat agree, there were some instances where politically appointed leaders hindered scientific integrity; there were others where we fought to craft language such that the scientists felt that integrity was preserved.
258
leadership tendency to focus on past decisions or direction for site investigation-- may ignore certain factors or contaminants that might add complications.
259 N/A
260 NA
261 Whether there was actual interference or not, the atmosphere of excess caution and "oversight" implied that certain ideas might not "fly" and had a chilling effect. I think that scientists willingly adapted to the environment ... often on their own ... to prevent impacts on their career.
262 On my previous answer, while they are not directly applicable to my duties, my interaction with my colleagues are the basis of my response.
263 Over focus on boiling everything down to "1-pager" for briefing, which often was edited for 6 months, such that science project could be understood, tho ultimately no decisions made.
264 Who cares about science?, it is all about data, data data and bean count.
265 Nobody at HQ cared about science.
266 First line manager is an engineer and expressed negative bias towards scientists.
267 Political drivers hindered scientific integrity during the time period in question (2019-2020)
268 politics
269 The EJ effort is needed and appropriate. Selecting priority environmental areas, based in part on the demographics of a community, in some cases may lead to impartial decisions that are not fully based on science. The current EJ policy can sometimes lead to errors - a priority site needs to be based on scientific proof of contamination, not on a genera rule that EJ areas are more contaminated than others. Sometimes, highly contaminated areas are not in EJ areas. These should not be deprioritized because of the demographics of a community, in any way.
270 Being kept out of loop. Input, when allowed, often ignored.
271 Official Time to participated in professional organizations
272 available research data, participation of other government organizations
273 None
274 My first and second line managers have been helpful in discussing the issues noted in the prior two comments. Similarly, my DEO has been a great resource for those types of discussions.
275
Political leadership misrepresented scientific findings in documents, including in preamble for a rulemaking. Any comments that I made to documents questioning the scientific accuracy of statements that the political leadership had made in that document and in supporting documents to those policy documents were essentially ignored. Comments that other staff scientists, technical experts, and I made in our reviews of a white paper written by a political appointee were ignored.
276 Policy disagreements on how science should be used were pervasive and lead to open expression of challenges at the most senior levels of the Agency.
277 Open and honest communication with the public has been significantly hindered and continues still today
278 trump policies
279 Desired outcomes predetermined.
280 None
281 Program Offices not following the Action Development Process for Tier 1 actions (no workgroup)
282 I'm not a scientist, but my sense is that there were some or possibly many scientific efforts that were allowed to proceed uninhibited over the last 2 years. However, there were some high profile actions where there appeared to be a lack of scientific integrity and that might have influenced other actions, as well as the perceptions of the agency's scientific integrity as a whole over that time.

283 Advance notification delays timing.
284 No additional comment.
285 We use any scientific information available at the moment to make decision making about environmental affairs.
286 A few (b) (6) routinely overstep their legal judgement into technical and scientific decisions, trying to overrule the scientific opinions of staff.
287 I think the Trump Administration during openly rejected publicizing scientific results that were not in line with their policies.
288 Managers are too political and lack the necessary scientific knowledge to make appropriate decisions
289 none
290
Although I firmly hold that the following conditions do not reflect the Agency as a whole, in some cases - arrogance, audacity, and a doctrinaire manner of scientific thought.
291
(b) (5)
292 N/A
293 the extreme politics of the past administration and its extreme efforts to undermine and dismiss science political appointees from the last administration that had no ethic of scientific integrity, who ofttimes dismissed good solid science, seemingly not even believing in science.
294 (b) (6) has cloned the staff and any diverse approaches are minimal.
295 (b) (5)
296 Policy has driven our rulemaking efforts for the past 10 years, not the science. We have to "change" the science to match the policy
297 None.
298 For 2019-2020, political appointees affected decisions that should have been made based on science and resources. Instead, some decisions appeared to be driven by political forces.
299
Knowing what language is concerning across offices is impossible. There is no functional guidance on how cross-office review works or when it is required at the researcher level.
300 Hinder: # of FTEs at (b) (6) for chemists
301 The item referenced "my submission to peer reviewed scientific journals" and I have made no such submissions.
302 (b) (6)
303 None
304
(b) (5), (b) (6)
305 Republican politics and Trump specifically.
306
Upper management's support of decision-makers who retaliated against scientists who raised valid integrity concerns. This problem did not go away on January 21.
307 N/A
308 Management was willing to ignore problems to help businesses/industry.
309 (b) (5)
310 political pressure associated with appointed officials hindered advancing science and scientific integrity at the regional level in some cases.
311 n/a
312
Any fear that top level employees will alter the facts/information in a report will hinder scientific integrity efforts as well as believability by the public of any findings.
313 Too many EPA internal bureaucratic obstacles, so scientists don't have the time or mind necessary for the creative expression of scientific environmental systems thinking the general public needs to think and act from.
314 State, local, and tribal politics can often hinder any working/final product with any summary or conclusions about scientific data or regulatory ramifications. Technical staff may be required to remove or reframe certain conclusions that leave out important context which may greatly diminish transparency to the public. Senior mgmt often have no backbone and would rather listen to their groupies than technical staff.
315 (b) (5), (b) (6)
316 Short unreasonable turn-around timeframes hinder my ability to conduct a rigorous technical analysis.
317 oversight by politicals hindered scientific integrity efforts.
318 I worked in an area where the science was explicitly sidelined for policy/legal considerations
319 No additional Comment
320 Political leadership and the people they placed in non political positions under the previous administration heavily influenced scientific work.
321 (b) (5) .
322 Prior Administration's efforts to hold up good science or twist use of data to benefit a policy choice instead of using science as intended
323
Too many bureaucratic hoops and too few opportunities to pursue the science needs of the agency. (b) (5) , is being pursued and redundancy avoided. The scientific method must be employed in every setting.
324 I work in HR. Not related to this.
325 Think decisions and information sharing over the calendar years for this survey walked very close to the line between policy choices and science leading to some uncertainty, allegations, mistrust, etc.
326
Unclear why document approvals were delayed and who delayed them. Documents not brought back for a final workgroup review before release, even though changes may have been made by reviewers. Public relations or internal communications about the work product that are incorrect scientifically and confusing.
327
Factors that hindered: The Trump Administration had a chilling effect on scientific integrity. Many colleagues were scared to even say the word climate change. Although I was never directly ordered to purge (b) (6) material, there was a tacit understanding that we should no longer be using our (b) (6) at various community outreach events. It was beyond disheartening to see this type of self censorship taking place. (b) (5), (b) (6)
328 N/A
329 Budget has hindered scientific integrity efforts in one case: support for web site is limited due to budgets for contractor support.

330 [redacted]

331 No clear interest in the general advancement of scientific knowledge.